



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/568,098	06/20/2006	Steffen Goletz	4652.1000-000	8158

21005 7590 05/05/2011
HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.
530 VIRGINIA ROAD
P.O. BOX 9133
CONCORD, MA 01742-9133

EXAMINER

LEAVITT, MARIA GOMEZ

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1633

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/05/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/568,098	Applicant(s) GOLETZ ET AL.	
	Examiner MARIA LEAVITT	Art Unit 1633	

All Participants:

(1) Anne Collins.

(2) Laurence Shumway.

Date of Interview: 2 May 2011

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Status of Application: _____

(3) Maria Leavitt.

(4) Joseph Woitach.

Time: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

The examiner contacted Applicants' representative, Laurence Shumway, to discuss an amendment to the pending claims filed on 05/25/2010 to overcome rejection of the claims under 35 USC § 103, 35 USC § 102(b), 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph and USC § 112 first paragraph –New matter, to set forth the claims in condition for allowance. Additionally, the examiner requested filing of a terminal disclaimer over US Patent 7,595,192. Applicants' representative asserted that a TD over claims of US. Patent 7,595,192 was not necessary based on the initial restriction of the instant invention which was made final by the examiner in the office action filed on 01/27/2009. It was decided that a TD over US Patent 7,595,192 was not necessary as the product by process lysate of claim 1 of US Patent 7,595,192 was a distinct invention from the instant claimed cell lines. Further, Applicants approved an examiner's amendment to claims 1, 3 (c) and 11.

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Maria Leavitt/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1633

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)